

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DAVID A. STEBBINS,
Plaintiff,

v.

KARL POLANO, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. 21-cv-04184-JSW

**ORDER REGARDING BRIEFING
SCHEDULE FOR MOTION TO
INTERVENE AND DENYING
EMERGENCY MOTION TO
PRESERVE EVIDENCE**

Re: Dkt. Nos. 141, 145

On April 27, 2022, Plaintiff submitted a request for an extension of time to file his response to the motion to intervene filed by Alphabet Inc., and YouTube LLC. Although styled as a motion, the parties stipulated to modify the briefing and hearing schedule. Before the Court ruled on the request to modify the briefing schedule, Plaintiff filed his opposition to the motion to intervene. (Dkt. No. 144.) Accordingly, the Court GRANTS, IN PART, and DENIES, IN PART, the motion for an extension of time. Plaintiff's request for an extension of time to submit his opposition is DENIED AS MOOT because he has already filed his response. The proposed Intervenor shall submit their reply, if any, by no later than June 1, 2022. The Court VACATES the hearing scheduled for June 3, 2022. If the Court determines a hearing is necessary, it will issue a separate order notifying the parties.

//

//

//

//

//

//

On April 28, 2002, Plaintiff filed a motion styled as an “emergency motion to order the preservation of evidence.” (Dkt. No. 145.) Plaintiff seeks sweeping relief based on the removal of a video he claims is relevant to the pending motion to intervene. Plaintiff provides no legal basis for the relief he seeks, and his motion is DENIED. The Court has previously cautioned Plaintiff that filing noncompliant and frivolous motions will lead to the imposition of sanctions, including being declared a vexatious litigant, and the Court reiterates that admonishment here.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 3, 2022



JEFFREY S. WHITE
United States District Judge